

NOTE ON THE GENUS *ARICIA* OF GRAY.

By H. O. N. SHAW, F.Z.S.

Read 8th December, 1911.

THE sub-genus *Aricia* was created by Gray in his *Descriptive Catalogue of Shells*, 1832, pp. 7-12, which, it has been conclusively proved, was never published, and can therefore only be regarded as a manuscript.<sup>1</sup> It was formed on conchological grounds for fifty-two species of *Cypræa*, in which were included *C. moneta* and *C. annulus* (p. 8), and contained a collection of species which in no way resemble each other. Whether the characters of the shells were sufficiently distinctive on which to form a sub-genus, which has by Gray himself and others been raised to generic rank, is a matter for each Cypræologist to determine for himself. The point in question is this. As the *Descriptive Catalogue* cannot be accepted as a publication, the first time the generic or sub-generic appellation *Aricia* was published in connexion with Mollusca was by Herrmannsen, *Indicis generum Malac.*, suppl., p. 12, 1852, and contained *C. moneta* only, but as he gave no description of the genus it must be considered as first published in the *Genera of Recent Mollusca*, H. & A. Adams, vol. i, pp. 265-6, 1854, type *C. annulus*, next *C. moneta*. Previous, however, to this use by Herrmannsen in 1852, Adams in 1854, or even by Gray in 1832, *Aricia* had been employed generically by Savigny in 1822,<sup>2</sup> *Description de l'Égypte: Système des Annelides*, vol. i, pt. iii, pp. 3, 12; also by Robineau-Desvoidy in 1830, *Essai sur les Myodaires*, p. 486; and by Macquart in 1835, *Histoire naturelle des Insectes Diptères* (Suites à Buffon), vol. ii, p. 285. It is therefore clear that this name cannot, according to the rules of priority, be retained for a genus or sub-genus of Mollusca. As I have already indicated, Gray's genus contained widely different species, and the group consisted of fifty-two species of *Cypræa*. The next writer to split up *Cypræa* into different genera (on anatomical grounds) was Troschel, *Das Gebiss der Schnecken*, vol. i, pp. 205, 212, 1856. In this work he used the genus *Aricia*, Gray, and created the sub-genus *Monetaria* for ten species of *Cypræa*, containing *C. moneta*, *C. annulus*, and *C. obrallata*. Since *Aricia* was created for *C. moneta* amongst others, it is clear that this genus or sub-genus, according to the value assigned to it, must now be known as *Monetaria*, Troschel.

Jousseume in 1884, Bull. Soc. Zool. France, p. 96, used *Monetaria*, Troschel, as a genus. Although he restricted the species contained in it to *C. moneta*, *C. icterina*, *C. annulus*, and *C. obrallata*, he retained *C. moneta* as his type. A footnote by Rochebrune, Bull. Soc. Malac. France, vol. i, p. 74, 1884, gives in six lines a certain amount of the information contained in the present paper, but as no references, etc., are given, it is hoped that the further information now added may be of use.

<sup>1</sup> Sherborn & Shaw, "Sowerby's *Conchological Illustrations* and Gray's *Descriptive Catalogue of Shells*": Proc. Malac. Soc., vol. viii, pt. vi, pp. 331-40, Sept., 1909. Shaw, "Notes on the genera *Cypræa* and *Trivia*": *ibid.*, pt. v, pp. 289-90, July, 1909.

<sup>2</sup> Date taken from Sherborn, "On the Dates of the Natural History portion of Savigny's *Description de l'Égypte*": Proc. Zool. Soc., 1897, pp. 285-8.